

DRAWING AMENDMENTS:

Please enter the Replacement Sheets for FIGS. 2-6.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11 remain in the application and under consideration. Claims 3, 4, 9 and 12-18 have been withdrawn. Independent claim 1 has been amended significantly to define the invention more clearly. Dependent claim 6 has been amended to conform to amended claim 1. Additionally, all of the remaining claims that are under consideration in the application have been amended to eliminate the reference numerals. Reference numerals are not required under U.S. patent law and are given no patentable weight. Accordingly, amendments to eliminate the reference numerals are not narrowing amendments and are not amendment enter for purposes of patentability.

The Examiner objected to FIGS. 3 and 4. FIGS. 3 and 4 have been amended, and replacement sheets are attached.

The Examiner objected to the abstract in view of language that the Examiner considered too vague and/or confusing. The original abstract has been deleted and a new abstract has been entered.

The Examiner objected to the original title. The title has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion.

The Examiner objected to the format for referencing certain of the prior art documents described in the application and noted that two of the documents were not submitted as part of the original Information Disclosure Statement.

The specification has been amended to address these comments of the Examiner. In particular, counsel has determined that the reference described at paragraph 0005 is the equivalent of Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No. 2001-197649. A copy of the latter document is available along with an English language abstract.

Accordingly, the specification has been amended at paragraph 0005 to refer to JP2001-197649. Additionally, a Second Information Disclosure Statement is submitted concurrently with this amendment and refers to JP2001-197649 publication. A copy of the publication and the English language abstract is attached to the Second Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner also noted that the registered utility Japanese model mentioned in paragraph 0006 was not submitted as part of the Information Disclosure Statement. The Examiner may appreciate that the JPO website is not as user friendly as the USPTO website. Problems arise particularly with respect to utility models. However, counsel has been able to obtain the utility model referenced in paragraph 0006. That document has been identified in the Second Information Disclosure Statement and a copy of that document along with a partial English language translation is submitted as part of the Second Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner objected to the reference to the first prior art and the second prior art in paragraph 0007 and 0008. Those paragraphs have been amended to refer to the references more clearly.

The Examiner objected to the description of figures appearing in paragraphs 0036 and 0038. Those paragraphs have been rewritten in view of the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner noted inconsistent use of terminology for identifying the element 31. Paragraph 0046 has been amended to ensure that the element 31 is referred to by the same terminology as employed in paragraph 0047.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner identified specific terms in those claims that were considered by the Examiner to be vague or misleading.

The claims have been amended to address the section 112 rejections.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Doshita. The Examiner identified parts of the Doshita reference that were considered to correspond to the original claims.

It is believed that the Doshita patent cited in the Office Action suffers from precisely the same deficiencies as the Japanese reference 2001-197649 described in the application. In particular, the two hingedly connected link arms of Doshita and the JP2001-197649 reference require substantial space particularly if there is a large sliding distance of the slider. The Doshita guide rail 37 arguably is the equivalent of the substantially linear rail recited in the first subparagraph of amended claim 1. The Doshita slide block 39 arguably corresponds to the slider recited in the second subparagraph of amended claim 1. The Doshita link arms 4 and 5 then would have to be compared to the claimed cable guide recited in the third subparagraph of amended claim 1. However, the end of the Doshita link arm 4 farthest from the slider 39 is connected again to the rail 37 of Doshita. In contrast, the cable guide recited in the third subparagraph of amended claim 1 has a first end coupled to the slider and a second end spaced from the rail. Amended claim 1 then positively recites a fixing portion coupled to the second end of the cable guide and spaced from the rail. With this claimed construction, the cable can be guided through the passages of the slider, the cable guide and the fixing portion. In contrast, Doshita has a portion 3b of the cable extending externally of the link arms 4 and 5 to some undisclosed location for connection to the door. It is submitted that the Doshita has no suggestion of a


cable guide formed to undergo a bending deformation about a plurality of axes and only in a specified plane, and with a cable guide having a first end coupled to the slider and a second end opposite the first end and spaced from the rail. Doshita also has no suggestion of a fixing portion coupled to the second end of the cable guide and spaced from the rail. Accordingly, it is submitted that Doshita does not anticipate the invention defined by amended claim 1. The Examiner has not raised an obviousness rejection of claim 1 based on Doshita. However, it submitted that the Doshita assembly would have to be completely redesign to bring Doshita closer to the invention defined by amended claim 1. No such redesigned is suggested in Doshita.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Doshita considered in view of Ayran. The Examiner relied upon Ayran for the particular construction of the slider and the rail-side engaging portion.

It is submitted that the Ayran slider does not overcome the deficiencies of Doshita as explained above.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the amended claims defined patentable subject matter and allowance is solicited. The Examiner is urged to contact applicant's attorney at the number below to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.

Atty. Reg. No. 30,066

Customer No. 001218

CASELLA & HESPOS LLP

274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703

New York, NY 10016

Tel. (212) 725-2450

Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: May 22, 2006



ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

A slider (25) is mounted on a rail (23) secured to a slide door (21) to support a door-side end of a stretching part (31) of a cable that extends between a vehicle body (28) and the slide door (21). The cable is introduced into a cable guide (27) and guided between the slider (25) and a fixing member (35). The cable guide (27) is formed by coupling a plurality of pieces (39) to undergo a bending deformation substantially in a plane, and takes up a slack of the cable while stabilizing the shape of the slackened cable.